

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

CARLA JO MASTERSON,

Plaintiff(s),

V.

THE WALT DISNEY COMPANY, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No.: 2:18-cv-00989-JCM-NJK

ORDER

Pending before the Court is an order for attorney Bradley Booke to show cause why he should not be subject to the requirements in Local Rule IA 11-1(b) for attorneys who are admitted in Nevada but do not maintain an office here. Docket No. 10. Mr. Booke has filed a response. Docket No. 11. That response represents that Mr. Booke is physically in Nevada roughly one week per month to provide legal services. *Id.* at ¶ 5. Mr. Booke also asserts essentially that he has a set-up that amounts to a virtual office here, with a receptionist and workspace that is shared with unrelated professionals. *Id.* at ¶¶ 4, 7.

23 It is not entirely clear to the Court that Mr. Booke “maintains an office in Nevada” for
24 purposes of Local Rule IA 11-1(b).¹ At the same time, Mr. Booke is implicitly attesting that he is

26 ¹ Indeed, it appears to the Court that Mr. Booke has described the equivalent of a mail-drop
27 location at which he occasionally uses shared office space as the need arises. The local rules
28 expressly direct that a “mail-drop location does not constitute an office under this rule.” Local
Rule IA 11-1(b)(1). Mr. Booke has presented no legal authority that participation in a shared
workspace that may be occupied at any given time by completely unrelated professionals qualifies
as “maintaining an office.” The changing occupancy of this physical space appears to doom Mr.

1 able to fully comply with his litigation obligations. *See, e.g.*, Docket No. 11 at ¶5 (“As necessary,
2 I am also physically present in Las Vegas for litigation work”). The purpose behind the
3 requirement to have counsel physically present in Nevada is clear: such presence is necessary,
4 *inter alia*, to enable efficient service on counsel, to ensure personal attendance at court hearings,
5 and to foster scheduling of depositions. Given the circumstances, the Court will defer ruling
6 conclusively on whether Mr. Booke is subject to the requirements in Local Rule IA 11-1(b). The
7 Court may revisit this issue at any time, and will be especially inclined to do so in the event that it
8 becomes clear that Mr. Booke’s non-presence in the state is a hindrance to the efficient
9 advancement of this litigation.²

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 Dated: June 28, 2018

12 
13 Nancy J. Koppe
14 United States Magistrate Judge

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26 Booke’s position. *See* Black’s Law Dictionary (7th ed.) (defining “maintenance” as “[t]o continue
27 in possession of (property, etc.”)).

28 ² Of course, nothing herein prevents Mr. Booke from complying with Local Rule IA 11-
1(b) without further Court order so as to put this issue to rest.